

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Hodge Charles" <hodge-charles@dol.gov>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 6:45 PM
Subject: FW: support of descriptive video regulations:

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Hodge Charles
 > Sent: Monday, February 25, 2002 6:51 PM
 > To: 'info@acb.org'
 > Subject: support of descriptive video regulations:

>
 > 1131 South Forest Drive
 > Arlington, Virginia 22204
 > Monday, February 25, 2002

>
 > Mr. William Caton, Secretary
 > Federal Communications Commission
 > 445 12th Street, Southwest
 > Washington, D.C. 20554

>
 > Re: mm Docket No. 99-339

>
 > Dear Secretary Caton:

>
 > I am writing to you as an individual citizen who enjoys watching
 > television and who also happens to be totally blind. I was happy to learn
 > that in the summer of 2000 the FCC had issued a final order containing
 > requirements that at least fifty hours per quarter of prime time and/or
 > children's television programming must contain video description.
 > Although a small step in the overall universe of television programming,
 > this minimal video description requirement imposed by the FCC was
 > important to me and other blind and visually impaired television
 > programming consumers as an important first step in bringing to us more
 > informative and educational television programming.

> I was naturally most unhappy to hear that a number of parties in the
 > telecommunications industry (along with the National federation of the
 > Blind, nfb) have brought legal challenges threatening to overturn the
 > Commission's descriptive video order in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the
 > District of Columbia Circuit. Now, I am most distraught to learn that the
 > industry appellants have filed a petition with the FCC to stay the
 > effective date (April 1, 2002) of its descriptive video final order
 > pending a decision on appeal of the industry parties' challenge to that
 > order.

> The industry appellants' stay petition attempts to convince and persuade
 > the Commission that the industry appellants' have satisfied the very
 > exacting legal standards warranting the granting of such a stay by the
 > Commission pending decision on appeal. Yet, I believe that the industry

2/28/02

> appellants have failed to carry their very high and substantial burden of
> proof with respect to the central and pivotal matter of whether these
> parties are substantially likely to prevail in their challenges to
> overturn the Commission's final descriptive video order on appeal before
> the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Other than setting forth this crucial
> standard and baldly asserting that these industry appellants have met their
> burden of proof under that standard, the petition fails utterly to offer
> any evidence that in fact the industry appellants are substantially likely
> to win their case on appeal. Other than arguing the jurisdiction and
> authority of the Commission (arguments which were thoroughly considered
> and rejected on solid legal grounds before the Commission), the industry
> appellants offer only an argument regarding "compelled or mandated speech"
> as a new or novel ground for their legal challenge on appeal. The U.S.
> Supreme Court has only considered the "compelled or mandated speech"
> doctrine in a handful of cases, and such an argument was squarely rejected
> when the high court upheld the authority of the Surgeon-General to require
> warnings against cigarette smoking on all cigarette packages. Thus, I do
> not believe that the industry appellants are substantially likely to
> succeed in their appeal before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals or
> eventually before the U.S. Supreme Court itself.

> In addition, the petitioners make assertions as to costs of compliance
> and the fact that their requested stay would only delay implementation of
> the FCC's descriptive video final order for less than a year. Yet, if
> these appellants lose their case before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals,
> you can be very sure that they will be petitioning the U.S. Supreme Court
> for review and making application for an extension of the requested stay
> before the Commission for a further indefinite time period to permit the
> Supreme Court to rule in this case. Thus, please, do not be lulled to
> sleep by such ad hominem arguments. For all of the reasons set forth
> above, I respectfully ask the Commission to deny the industry appellants'
> petition for a stay. I fervently pray that the Commission will allow its
> long overdue and ground breaking descriptive video final order to go in to
> effect as scheduled on April 1, 2002.

> In closing, please, permit me to thank you and the Commission for your
> and its consideration of the views herein set forth, and I hope and trust
> that the Commission will deny the industry appellants' petition for stay of
> the descriptive video final order now pending before it.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Charles S. P. Hodge, Esq.

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Patti Johnson" <pat@iglou.com>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:59 PM
Subject: I Support Video Description

My name is Patti Johnson and I wanted to write to express my opinions on the importance of video description. I have enjoyed movies that are available with the audio description, and have always felt it would be a great boost in the way I could enjoy television if programs were also described. To me, this is just one more way I can be independent, something which is of utmost importance to me. And anybody who knows me can tell you that my independence is just about the most important part of my life. Why shouldn't I have the privilege to get as much out of television as any one else. I shouldn't have to ask some one else what is happening on the screen, or just miss out on knowing, just because I cannot see the screen. If the technology is there which it so obviously is then it needs to be used. If closed caption is available for the deaf, then video/audio description needs to become available for the blind.

Sincerely,
Patti Johnson

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Bob and Dee Olson" <deeo1@mindspring.com>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:50 PM
Subject: "I Support Video Description"

Mr. William Caton, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 15th Street, SW
Washington, DC 29554

Reference MM Docket no. 99-339.

Dear Mr. Caton:

I am writing to you in support of Descriptive Video Services and vehemently object to the request of the movie, cable, and broadcast industry to stay the implementation of DVS on April 1, 2002.

It is a great shame to the entertainment industry to deny the blind and visually impaired community this right, given that the industry prides itself as being socially responsible to the public. Blind and visually impaired people all over the country have waited since the issuance of the order to finally have access to television programming. By taking that away from them, the networks send the message that they are apathetic to the needs of the blind, thus further contributing to decades of discrimination towards this community.

I wholeheartedly support the FCC's DVS order, and hope that you will not back down and allow the entertainment industry to manipulate the legal system in its favor once again.

Sincerely,

Bob and Dolores Olson

237 So. Murphy Way
Prescott, Az. 86303
Phone # 928-776-9141

E-Mail add: deeo1@mindspring.com

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapive

From: "Chris and Mike" <hughperson@earthlink.net>
To: <Info@ACB.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:38 PM
Subject: I support video description

Mr. William Caton, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St SW
Washington, DC 20554
Reference MM Docket no. 99-339

Christine Murphy
5623 116 Place SE
Bellevue, WA 98006

February 25, 2002

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing to express my fervent support for the implementation of video description for television programming which those of us in the blind community are hoping will be approved this April.

Video description will enable us to have access to visual information shown on TV that sighted people take for granted. This information includes but is not limited to: emergency instructions and warnings, news programming, documentaries, and a wide range of entertainment programming.

In our society, television is used to convey a tremendous amount of information. Disregarding our need for full participation is a truly disillusioning example of how capitalism, when unregulated, can result in the welfare of real people being discounted as meaningless. In comparison to the production costs of television programs, the cost of providing video description is miniscule.

Those of us who are blind have a right to the same degree of access to information in television broadcasts as any other people in the United States. When we continue to be excluded from visual information, even though readily achievable technological solutions exists which could remove these barriers, our sense of exclusion and frustration keeps intensifying. Bear in mind that the number of people having visual handicaps keeps increasing as the population ages. Please be proactive and implement solutions that will meet the increasing need for non-visual information! Support the use of technology to enable us to fully enjoy and benefit from what television offers. Support the availability of video description!

Sincerely yours,
Christine Murphy

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "J.D. Olson" <pd2glf@yahoo.com>
To: <Info@ACB.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:31 PM
Subject: I support video description

Mr. William Caton, Secretary
 Federal Communications Commission
 445 15th Street, SW
 Washington, DC 29554

Reference MM Docket no. 99-339.

Dear Mr. Caton:

I am writing to you in support of Descriptive Video Services and vehemently object to the request of the movie, cable, and broadcast industry to stay the implementation of DVS on April 1, 2002.

It is a great shame to the entertainment industry to deny the blind and visually impaired community this right, given that the industry prides itself as being socially responsible to the public. Blind and visually impaired people all over the country have waited since the issuance of the order to finally have access to television programming. By taking that away from them, the networks send the message that they are apathetic to the needs of the blind, thus further contributing to decades of discrimination towards this community.

I wholeheartedly support the FCC's DVS order, and hope that you will not back down and allow the entertainment industry to manipulate the legal system in its favor once again.

Sincerely,

Jamie Olson

9634 East Camino Del Santo

Scottsdale, Arizona 85260-4415

Home: 480-451-7204

Cellular: 602-510-9370

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Greetings - Send FREE e-cards for every occasion!

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapive

From: "GEORGIA KELLOGG" <TALLYGEORGIA@EARTHLINK.NET>
To: <Info@ACB.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 7:52 PM
Subject: I support Video.

We are real people who just happen to be blind and we want the same access as sighted people to television and movies. Don't write us off. We should have access to descriptive video by April in television programming or film. Show us you are socially responsible by not postponing this matter. Georgia Kellogg
4144 Kreisch Way
Tallahassee, FL 32305

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "John Walters" <dipwart@ellijay.com>
To: "Michael K. Powell: Chairman" <mpowell@fcc.gov>; "Kathleen Q. Abernathy: Commissioner" <kabernat@fcc.gov>; "Michael J. Copps: Commissioner" <mcopps@fcc.gov>; "Kevin J. Martin: Commissioner" <kjmweb@fcc.gov>
Cc: "Rebecca Rose" <rebrose@bellsouth.net>; <CCrawford@ACB.org>; <Info@ACB.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 7:14 PM
Subject: Video Description: MM Docket No. 99-339

26 February 2002

Commissioners
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: MM Docket no. 99-339

Dear Mr. Chairman and Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission:

It has recently come to my attention that the movie, cable, and broadcast industry are attempting to avoid implementing video description. I believe that failure to implement this excellent service, particularly in light of our technological capability, would be of severe disservice to the visually impaired, and others. Since video description enhances the quality of the broadcast presentation, I see no reason it should be denied anyone who wants it.

I strongly urge you to support the visually impaired citizens and afford them the same right of enjoyment of television and movies as everybody else by implementing the video description technology into our visual and broadcast media. Thank you for your attention in this matter. I am

Sincerely yours,

John B. Walters III
26 North Pine Road
Ellijay, GA 30540

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Louis Kim Kline" <k2lkk@frontiernet.net>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 9:03 PM
Subject: I support video description

February 27, 2002

Dear Commissioners:

As a visually impaired citizen of this nation, I urge you in the strongest terms to continue to strive to require the inclusion of video discription of broadcast programs in the United States. While I recognize that there is a monetary investment involved, I also would argue that as a citizen of this nation, I have a right to receive the same information as those who are sighted.

Broadcasters need to remember that they operate at least in part in the public interest and one aspect of operation in the public interest is in presenting broadcasts in such a way that the material can be received and understood by everyone.

I would invite anyone who doubts the necessity of this action to turn the brightness and contrast controls on their telvesion set all the way down for an evening, and see how much they are able to figure out of what is being portrayed on the screen.

I have in recent times been a user of the DVS video tapes that are made available from WGBH, and after getting several of these videos, and listening to the description of movies which I had heard non-DVS versions in the past, it was very clear to me that there is often very significant meaning, sometimes critical to fully understanding the story, which is lost when one cannot see the picture.

I have no way of knowing what I do not see on current commercial television, but I am sure that I do miss some things. Why shouldn't the broadcasters that hold a license to use the public airwaves, which do belong to all of us, be required to present the materials which they broadcast in a manner that can be clearly understood by all of us?

To my way of thinking, this is a natural extension of the requirements for web sites to be accessible, and for public places to be accessible. Sure, these things cost money, but we require these accommodations because it is the right thing to do. In my opinion, it is part of the price that one pays for the privilege of occupying a slice of the public airwaves, and using those airwaves to produce a profit.

Thank you very much for hearing my views on this subject. Once again, I would strongly urge you to retain these requirements and require broadcasters to observe the time lines originally set forth.

2/28/02

Respectfully yours,
Louis K. Kline
12 Dunn St.
Rochester, NY 14621-2308

Louis (Kim) Kline, A.R.S. K2LKK
e-mail: k2lkk@frontiernet.net
Work e-mail: kim_kline@abvi-goodwill.com
Work Tel. (585) 697-5753

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Gayle Zodrow" <zodrowg@worldnet.att.net>
To: <Info@ACB.org>
Cc: <CCrawford@ACB.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2002 12:15 AM
Subject: I support video description

2983 La Questa
Prescott, AZ 86305
February 27, 2002

Mr. William Caton, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

SUBJECT: Reference MM Docket No. 99-339

Dear Mr. Caton:

It is unfair to allow the movie, cable, and broadcast industry off the hook in providing descriptive video to the blind viewing audience. In September 2000, the FCC promulgated a new rule that required the four major television networks in the 25 top markets to provide four hours of video descriptive services during prime time and children's programs every week. The major networks have already chosen the programs slated for description and have contracted with various organizations which are currently wrapping up their descriptions for the programs to be described during the first week of April. This new rule enacted by the FCC needs to take place as scheduled for April, 2002. It is discriminatory and unlawful to allow the trade associations to ignore the needs of the blind and visually impaired people in the United States. Their objections are without substance, their motives are suspect, and their behavior is more of a temper tantrum than the action of an industry that purports to care about its viewers.

Technology and strategies for implementing audio description are well understood and widely available already. Requiring the television industry to begin making the service available is a timely and reasonable thing to do. I am requesting the support of the FCC in carrying out this ruling by the April 2002 deadline.

Sincerely,

Gayle Zodrow

cc Charles Crawford, Executive Director

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapive

From: "Nelson Malbone" <vabn@erols.com>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 9:52 PM
Subject: MM Docket no. 99-339.

The Virginia Association of the Blind, Inc.
Alice Malbone, Executive Director
2625 Deerfield Crescent
Chesapeake, Virginia 23321-2418

February 26, 2002

Mr. William Caton, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St SW
Washington, DC 20554.
Reference MM Docket no. 99-339.

Dear Sir:

The Virginia Association of the Blind, Inc. is a non-profit charitable service organization made up of blind, partially blind, deafblind, and sighted persons, throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia, working together to improve the quality of life per persons with severe visual impairments.

We, as an organization, object to any further delay of the inception of descriptive video, which is scheduled to begin April 1, 2002. We strive to be independent as much as possible in our daily lives and this programming on television and in movies affords us this independence and we as concerned citizens deserve that right.

Our membership within the Commonwealth of Virginia number 800 plus and urge the television, cable and movie industry along with the Federal Communications Commission not to delay the April 1, 2002 date of inception.

Sincerely,

Alice Malbone, Executive Director

Cc: American Council of the Blind, Inc.
Charles Crawford, Executive Director
1155 15th Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20005

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Jo's mail" <librarian@mindspring.com>
To: <Info@ACB.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 9:45 PM
Subject: I Support Video Description

Video description makes all the difference in the world to people with vision loss. Make tv accessible. Make movies accessible. Do the right thing.
Joann Block

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapive

From: <swansong26@juno.com>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 9:12 PM
Subject: I support video description

Dear Mr. William Caton,

I have just been informed that the broadcast industry is trying to shirk their responsibility. They are apparently unwilling to spend a little money to produce audio descriptions as required through MM docket 99-399.

Here are two comments to consider. If a program is too confusing to follow for the many thousands of visually impaired persons in this country, they will turn it off. The advertisers will lose some potential customers. Also, do you and your colleagues think this service is unnecessary? Try watching ten minutes of a Sit Com with your eyes closed.

Please do the right thing. Give us the same access that sighted people have.

Sincerely,
Nancy Karstens
2217 S. 51st ST.
Omaha, Ne 68106

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "Frank Cuta" <cuta@bentonrea.com>
To: <info@acb.org>
Cc: "FRANK CUTA (E-mail)" <CUTA@ENGINEER.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2002 2:36 AM
Subject: I support video description

Frank Cuta
58903 Sweetwater PRNE
Benton City, WA 99320
(509) 967-2658
cuta@engineer.com

February 26, 2002

The Honorable William Caton-Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 15TH ST SW
Washington, D.C. 29554
RE: Docket #MM 99-339

Dear Secretary Caton:

I am a blind consumer and voter and am writing in support of the FCC's decision to require video description for television broadcasts. This matter is not just an equal access issue, but also a quality of life issue for everyone who can take advantage of the service.

On Friday February 22, 2002 members of The National Association of Broadcasters, The National Cable Telecommunications Association, and The Motion Picture Association of America, until after the outcome of a court appeal, filed a request for a stay of the implamentation of audio description ruling. This last minute stay request comes just weeks before the industry is required to start the new services and is simply an attempt by the industry to deny equal access to individuals with disabilities.

In the strongest terms I would like to stress my outrage at this ludicrous stay request. I implore you to deny this request, and force the implementation of the service as scheduled. The telecommunications industry appeal of this ruling is without merit and, in my opinion, will not stand up in court. Any further delays in the implementation of the service is unnecessary and will only help to serve the interests of the industry and undermine the FCC's position on this matter.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this extremely important matter. I eagerly look forward to the implementation of this long overdue service.

2/28/02

Sincerely,
Frank Cuta

2/28/02

Barbara Vodapivc

From: "john_slatin" <john_slatin@forum.utexas.edu>
To: <info@acb.org>
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2002 5:35 PM
Subject: I support video description

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a visually impaired faculty member and director of the Institute for Technology and Learning at the University of Texas at Austin. Both as a private citizen and as an educator, I strongly support full implementation of the video description rule, for which I and millions of other blind and visually impaired citizens have been waiting for so many years.

People who are blind and visually impaired are television owners and cable subscribers, in proportions virtually identical to those of the general population; people who are blind and visually impaired watch an average of more than 24 hours of television per week, again much like the general population. But we do not have equal access to most of what is on our sets; video description makes an **enormous** difference in the quality of our experience, enabling us to understand much more fully what is happening on the screen and enabling us to share the experience much more fully with our co-workers, our friends, and our families.

I have the distinct advantage of living in Austin, Texas, one of the few communities in Texas where audio description of films, theatrical performances, opera, and other cultural events is available through the services of VSArts of Texas. This has made a wonderful difference in my life; I have been able once again to enjoy movies with my wife, to go to plays and the opera with her and our friends, and to participate fully in conversation about the events we've been to. Such conversations have been a vital part of my life as a professor and as a person.

As an educator, I can assure you that **all** students-- not just those who are blind or visually impaired-- can benefit from the additional information provided by well executed descriptions. This is true of University students, and it is equally true of the K-12 students whom we serve at the Institute for Technology and Learning.

I urge the FCC to proceed toward full implementation of audio description.

Sincerely,

John M. Slatin

~~~~~  
Dr. John M. Slatin, Director  
Institute for Technology and Learning  
University of Texas at Austin  
FAC 248, Mailcode G9600

2/26/02

Austin, TX 78712  
ph 512-495-4288, fax 512-495-4524  
email [jslatin@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:jslatin@mail.utexas.edu)  
web <http://www.ital.utexas.edu>

**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** Jay Doudna <Jay@obs.org>  
**To:** <Info@acb.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2002 8:23 AM  
**Subject:** Descriptive Video

The Pennsylvania Council of the Blind enthusiastically supports the descriptive Video service.

Jay Doudna  
Overbrook School for the Blind  
6333 Malvern Ave  
Philadelphia Pa 19151  
[Jay@obs.org](mailto:Jay@obs.org)

2/26/02

**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** "MOLLIE LAKIN-HAYES" <mlakinhayes@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <Info@ACB.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2002 10:42 PM  
**Subject:** I support video description

Mr. William Caton, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 15th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 29554

Re: MM Docket no. 99-339.

Dear Mr. Caton:

I send you this urgent request for you not to delay the implementation of the video description rule for the broadcast and film industries.

The implementation of this rule is a basic and vital step in ensuring equal access to television broadcasts and film viewing by all Americans. As a citizen and taxpayer I feel strongly that it is a reasonable responsibility of these industries to comply with the rule as of the intended date. I strongly urge you, my representative to these industries, to require their compliance.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Mollie Lakin-Hayes  
523 W. Willetta St. #3  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

2/26/02

**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** "Steve Bauer" <stevebauer@kscable.com>  
**To:** <info@acb.org>  
**Cc:** "charles crawford" <ccrawford@acb.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 25, 2002 5:49 PM  
**Subject:** I Support Video Description

Mr. William Caton, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 15th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 29554

Reference MM Docket no. 99-339.

I am writing to express my opposition to extending the implementation date for "Descriptive Video Service." I encourage the FCC to honor its commitment and demand that the media start broadcasting DVS on schedule. Try watching television sometime with a blindfold on and you will quickly realize why descriptive video is so important. Imagine the fear you would have to hear an alert sounder for severe weather or other civil emergencies only to have no clue as to what the bulletin is about that is being scrolled across the screen. People who oppose providing services to assist persons with a disability have never had to face what it is like to live with a disability. Remember that disability is the one minority that you can join on a moments notice. Try and put yourself in our shoes and you will quickly realize it is imperative that descriptive video services be implemented as scheduled.

Thank you for your assistance.

Steve a. bauer  
3908 w. 18th St. N.  
Wichita, Kansas 67203  
Phone: (316) 383-1144

2/26/02

**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** "Kenneth Frasse" <kfrasse@4fbt.com>  
**To:** <info@acb.org>  
**Cc:** <smunoz13@attbi.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2002 5:01 PM  
**Subject:** I support video description

February 26, 2002

Mr. William Caton, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 15th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 29554

Reference MM Docket no. 99-339.  
Dear Mr. Caton,

I was recently informed of the National Association of Broadcasters, the National Cable Telecommunications Association and the Motion Picture Association of America's filing to stay the implementation of the video description rule until after the court appeal is decided.

This is very disappointing. As a blind businessman who pays taxes, and, at least at last glance of the U. S. Constitution and Federal access laws, I am entitled to the same privilege as sighted people. It is historically clear from empirical evidence that most corporate intentions and response is limited to lip-service. However, it is even more distressing that the governing bodies of my citizenship and welfare are mostly either ineffectual or unwilling to enforce the laws they enact.

I understand the political and legal ramifications of the television and motion picture industries' actions. What is not clear is, notwithstanding these companies' bottom-line, is how the FCC and these industries do not appear to realize that they are proposing denying complete access to these media to anyone who cannot see well. I suppose the AARP would have the strongest argument in favor of descriptive video, but the FCC has an obligation not to let it go that far.

I respectfully request that, while you address the concerns of industry, that you also remember and honor the original purpose of your government position. If you watch television news, you would realize that the public confidence in government has been eroding, particularly rapidly in the recent past. The DVS issue and whether or not the FCC upholds this basic access is a prime example. It is also what you will tell people about as an accomplishment when you become old, retired, and have failing sight.

Respectfully,

Kenneth Frasse  
FBT, Inc.

2/27/02

444 Castro Street, Suite 710  
Mountain View, CA 94040  
650.966.8731

cc:

Charles Crawford, ACB Executive Director

Kenneth Frasse  
CEO  
Flying Blind Technologies, Inc.  
[kfrasse@4fbt.com](mailto:kfrasse@4fbt.com)  
Tel: 1-650-966-8731  
Fax: 1-650-966-8732

[www.FlyingBlindTechnologies.com](http://www.FlyingBlindTechnologies.com)

2/27/02

**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** "David Lee" <flyingfruitbat@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <Info@ACB.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2002 7:24 PM  
**Subject:** I totally support video description

David Lee  
#111 301 G Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20024

2/27/02



**Barbara Vodapivc**

---

**From:** "max edelman" <silas\_01@email.msn.com>  
**To:** "am. con. blind" <info@acb.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2002 7:07 PM  
**Subject:** I support video description

Mr. William Caton, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington D. C.

February 26, 2002

Docket No. 99-339.

Dear Mr. Secretary,

I urge you in strongest terms to implement "Descriptive Video Service" (DVS) on schedule in April 2002.

The industry has power and money, but we the blind of America have the right and you Mr. Secretary have the obligation to make sure the industry does **not deny** us the access to that service. We the blind have waited long enough for the magnanimity of the industry. Please Mr. Secretary, be on the side of Right, assist us to obtain the long **delayed** access to described video service. Sincerely,

Max Edelman  
1608 Overbrook Rd.  
Lyndhurst oh 44124

2/27/02